	Case 2:20-cv-01900-WBS-JDP Document 3	88 Filed 04/13/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	00000	
11		
12	ERIC REASON, et.al.,	No. 20-cv-01900-WBS-EFB
13	Plaintiffs,	
14	V.	ORDER
15	CITY OF RICHMOND, a municipal corporation, et. al.,	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18 19	00000	
20	Assuming, without deciding, that plaintiffs' filing of	
21	their Second Amended Complaint was an attempt to exercise their	
22	right to amend their pleading once as a matter of course pursuant	
23	to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1), within three days of	
24	the signing of this Order plaintiffs are directed to re-file	
their Second Amended Complaint which the court previous		ich the court previously struck
-	(Docket No. 30). For the reasons discussed in the hearing	

April 12, 2021, the court does not address defendants' arguments

about futility, the relevant statute of limitations, or scope of

## Case 2:20-cv-01900-WBS-JDP Document 38 Filed 04/13/21 Page 2 of 2

employment in this order; rather, defendants will be permitted to address the sufficiency of plaintiffs' allegations in a motion to dismiss. No further amendments to the pleadings will be permitted without stipulation between the parties or leave of court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2021

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE